

**United States District Court**

Worcester U.S. District Court House

Lawsuit and complaint

Page | 1

**Defendant**

Matthew M. Kracher pro se  
Federal Governments Matthew M. Kracher  
15 Bowdoin Street  
Worcester Massachusetts  
01609

v.

**Plaintiff**

Theodor Van Stephoudt  
Bonnie Burrell Van Stephoudt  
VB Investments  
659 Front Street  
Marion Massachusetts  
02738

The defendant hereby moves within which such action is pending or otherwise a notice of removal signed pursuant to Rule 11 for the case being removed to United States Worcester District directly from the courts of Massachusetts. The defendant hereby provides a short and plain statement of grounds for removal.

**Filing 2 US Government Defendant Case Removal from State Court Matthew M. Kracher**

This lawsuit complaint to the US Government **defendant** would preferably be better off personally, if filed without agency connections. The defendant would personally prefer the case as a Federal question case. The defendant being a classified citizen for the duration of his life does not allow personal preference to determine the filing of this complaint and lawsuit as a Federal Question case. The U.S. Government defendant was born an American citizen of New Jersey everything that he is classified to is the Federal Government and United States Government, of the Jurisdiction he was classified in being the exact same thus the plaintiff's classification is Federal U.S. Government.

The defendant born in Mount Laurel New Jersey, first residence in Vincentown New Jersey, and classified in Moorestown New Jersey. To the defendant there is no federal question nor will be, at all, to ask, because the Government to him is one in the same, therefor, the case is a U.S. Government Federal case. Without correct US and Federal jurisdictions being one in the exact same, in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the defendant being a classified individual and all agency US government connections being themselves classified, still knowingly to the defendant do exist, thus this lawsuit and complaint are filed as U.S. Government defendant Matthew M. Kracher v. plaintiff VB Investments.

**Rule 10 Nature of Case Real Property**

The defendant does not like, trust, care, provide resources, nor has authorized any connection to, nor for neither Mr. nor Mrs. Van Stephoudt nor VB Investments to use in any official capacity. The defendant has never authorized abstract nor otherwise any official connection with United States Federal Government for VB Investments with VB Investments and is against their being a VB Investments.

Page | 2

The nature of the suit is a government case against VB Investment for (230) Rent and Lease and ejectment (440) other civil rights (448) Education (410) Anti-trust (950) Constitutionality of State Statutes. (865). The Plaintiff is filing nature of the suit RSI (405)g pertaining to payment of benefits he is owed. There are other grounds as well, the defendant is counter claiming the plaintiff and is very much against the plaintiff.

**Lawsuit Complaint****(230) Rent and Lease and Ejectment**

The defendant is against the Commonwealth of Massachusetts's Bonnie Burrell Van Stephoudt and for knowingly using her fraudulent, power of attorney over the real property of 15 Bowdoin Street in Worcester as an Instrument of fraud against the defendant, I am demanding a counter claim of \$26,000.00. The real property is located in the exact center of Massachusetts geographically. Bonnie Burrell Van Stephoudt has a falsified muniment on real property that is on the United States of America's property. Mrs. Bonnie Burrell Van Stephoudt and by proxy Mr. Van Stephoudt have used a scal and not a signature on the power of attorney document wrongfully and entered into court using the scal fraud document. The power of attorney document is needed to have muniment on and at the property of VB Investment, due to Mr. Van Stephoudt saying he is the owner, however, being foreign born he needs an American power of attorney to sign for the property. The power of attorney document can only have a signature on it, there is something other than a signature and that is a violation of law, in Massachusetts. Theodor Van Stephoudt is claiming ownership, however it is false muniment. The defendant lives at the established residence of 15 Bowdoin Street apartment three in Worcester. The defendant was in non-binding criminal fraudulent lease agreement. After having realized that the plaintiff made a non binding criminal offer to defendant in the original lease and how the plaintiffs were under false muniment, the defendant never again signs anything with VB Investments Bonnie Burrell Van Stephoudt nor Theodor Van Stephoudt. Matthew M. Kracher the defendant does pay the use and occupancy of \$1050.00 and splits the use and occupancy payment ordered by the Massachusetts housing court with a female co-occupant. The payments have been deposited to VB Investments no later than the 4<sup>th</sup> of any month while the defendant had been on appeal from the housing court. The defendant paid every dollar owed to Mr. and Mrs. Van Stephoudt on any lease agreement as well. The defendant feels at a minimum he should be on a tenant at will status, however knows, Mr. and Mrs Van Stephoudt do have fraudulent falsified muniment, false attestation, false return, falsified registration on the property. The defendant does not want to be in agreement with them, they don't have a binding offer possible to make on the real property. Never was there a binding lease in existence on the property and the defendant knows their ownership to be fraudulent, and doesn't consent to any agreement with them, because any offer they made was made criminal and they didn't have the right to offer it at all because it couldn't be binding.

**(230) Rent Lease and Ejectment (950) Constitutionality of State Statutes  
(440) Civil rights**

Mr. and Mrs. Van Stephoudt have used wrongful entry to the Commonwealth court in the Massachusetts lower court housing court systems, against the plaintiff's American rights. The ongoing fraud against the defendant, leaves him no acceptable circumstance other than this United States Government case. This case is ultimately and extensively and universally a Constitutional case. No Amicus briefs were filed on the lower court case. People sign their name to legitimize consent, validation, and agreement. They do not place a scal on documents instead. The making of a scal is at the origin against the entire Constitution and every American law it backs, from the very origin, the actual peoples signatures on United States Constitution are the living origin of Law in the United States of America. The Scal is no signature and is most certainly something other than a signature. The defendant refused to sign a lease extension realizing how corrupt the terms of lease were becoming. In the time the defendant has lived in Worcester, he never had an appreciation nor trust, for Mrs. Van Stephoudt nor Mr. Van Stephoudt. The defendant believes and knows that Mr. and Mrs. Van Stephoudt have wrongfully and otherwise illegally, unmorally, unethically, unlawfully, and knowingly on VB Investments behalf proceeded to a lower court against the defendant, neither without legitimate entry nor with a truthful display of their own knowledge and actions pertaining to Massachusetts Law and the entire system of universal written binding agreements the signature. The defendant knows that Mr. and Mrs. Van Stephoudt had knowingly and criminally entered a case in Worcester housing court against the defendant against the interest of justice and against the interests of the public and that certainly includes the defendant's civil rights and did so without grounds.

Page | 3

**(440) civil rights (448) education (410) anti-trust . Social Security RSI (405)g**

The defendant realizes that Mrs. Bonnie Burrell Van Stephoudt has an abstract renaissance criminal agenda, that, she predicates her criminal alleged success through connection of her work place at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and does so with her email address listed on her Worcester residential previously active lease. The crooks of Massachusetts Institute of Technology from the interlocking false muniment with a non-binding registered number, have used computer programs that divert funding from the appropriate individuals that would receive their checks at Social Security RSI and that is Anti-Trust. The power of Attorney document is the instrument of fraud with the falsified registration number that already has falsified attestation and registration of false attestation. Massachusetts Institute of Technology relies on her being a high witch with that document on file at the registry in Massachusetts. They use her fraud for Wikipedia and queer criminal endeavors. What she is and has been responsible for is the wrongdoing of pivoting Social Security funds that decrease the benefits of some and wrongfully pay to others. Mrs. Bonnie Burrell Van Stephoudt of VB Investments criminally provides false muniment and false attestation the return of the power of attorney document, from registry of deeds and probate in Worcester for illegally enterable grounds into court, providing VB Investments a commercial esque non binding conduit for Social Security fraud at Massachusetts Institute of Technology that MIT provides elsewhere and thus this criminal process of falsified muniment is a clear depiction of VB Investments being an instrument of Social Security anti-trust fraud.

**(950) Constitutionality of State Statutes (448) Education**

Massachusetts is not independent of Federal Government. Massachusetts cities and towns have no independent power of taxation through municipal law nor any form of enactment nor promulgation, nor in anyway shape nor form including education. The Commonwealth and State of Massachusetts are not one in the same to the Federal Government, and the Federal Government does not include nor should it care to or for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and their by-laws. The Federal Government does include the State of Massachusetts to get the fact right. The Commonwealth does not get represented by the Federal Government through the State of Massachusetts nor through the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to the Federal Government. The plaintiff knows this information and acts and proceeds with direct intentions of internal false State, County, and local muniment and malice hate and distain for the American rule of Law, over Massachusetts. The Massachusetts Institute of Technology isn't nationally accredited nor should the Massachusetts Institute of Technology ever be. **The Massachusetts Institute of Technology to the defendant is comprised of all criminals on a commonwealth by-law crime spree waiting on stolen funds or participating in stealing in Massachusetts, Las Vegas, and elsewhere. The Massachusetts Institute of Technology is looked down upon and hated by the defendant.**

Page | 4

**(440) Civil rights. RSI (405)g Social Security**

The defendant had been taken to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Housing Court for possession of the premises of 15 Bowdoin Street. The defendant lives on Social Security payments. This lawsuit is much more comprehensive than just the plaintiff's false muniment being against the interests of justice. The defendant is not U.S. Federal Government black listed. He knows he has rights and grounds to file, and has the full right to full Social Security benefits. The defendant receives survivor benefits. As an adult child already receiving disability benefits the defendant still is payable on a parent's earnings record. The wrongfull pivoting of funds in the defendants name has cut the defendants benefits illegally. It is rightful for an individual disabled since childhood to attain insured status on his or her own record and be entitled to higher benefits on a parent's record and the plaintiff is entitled as an American citizen who is disabled and not on a Federal Black List. The defendant wants his Federal benefits from Social Security and did not consent to them being pivoted through Massachusetts bylaws. The pivoting of Social Security funds decreases the benefits of some and wrongfully pay to others payments to interpret by-law muniment or other interpretations predicated off of her say so, alone, as a high witch, to placate the system itself anti citizen. Those wrongfully paid individuals rely on the promulgated marriage of Mr. and Mrs. Van Stephoudt to confuse the situation to the courts through VB Investments false muniment fraud.

**Anti-Trust (410)**

Mr. Theodor Van Stephoudt and Mrs. Bonnie Burrell Van Stephoudt of VB Investments provide false muniment and false attestation of return, from the registry of deeds and probate in Worcester that is non-binding and that should not grant them access into court, providing VB Investments a commercial esque conduit for Social Security fraud at Massachusetts Institute of Technology that they provide

elsewhere and thus is a clear interlocking depiction of VB Investments being an instrument of Social Security anti-trust fraud. The defendant is in no agreement whatsoever with the plaintiff nor Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The defendant desires no agreement with the plaintiff outside of court. The defendant counter claims with a demand for the real amount of \$26,000.00 and the absolute amount of payments he is owed from social security. This demand needs to be court ordered and paid. Outside of the demand being paid the defendant has no desire to interact personally interpersonally nor otherwise with VB Investments, and doesn't agree with any official existence nor otherwise of VB Investments and knows them to be as pure a form of Anti-Trust as has ever been.

Page | 5

#### **Social Security RSI (405)g Directly pertaining to the counter claim**

The defendant survivor benefit amount would be based on the earnings of the parent who died. The more the parent paid into Social Security, the higher benefits would be for the individual survivor. The defendants mother and father lifetime earnings are 4 million dollars plus. My mother made about 2 million dollars and my father made about 2 million dollars, and the defendant Matthew M. Kracher of 15 Bowdoin Street apartment three Worcester makes \$1851.00 a month in benefits. The amount the defendant is shorted at a minimum is 25% of the total. The amount the defendant would get is a percentage of the deceased's Social Security benefit and depends on the age and the defendant is and was when disabled age qualified and the type of benefit the defendant would be eligible to receive is RSI predicated off of (405) (g). There's a limit to the amount that family members can receive each month. The limit varies, but it is generally equal to about 150 to 180 percent of the basic benefit rate. I have not approved nor am consenting to my family members stealing my benefits neither basic nor otherwise. Social Security in Massachusetts with Mr. and Mrs. Van Stephoudts false muniment has wrongfully and maliciously interrupted their own wordings of by-law against the defendant and has authorized stolen federal funds wrongfully and illegally. Those funds are being paid in my name officially and I don't consent to pivoting funds, nor will I. Massachusetts does not have authorization from me to use my classification to pay my benefits to others, through any conduit at all. That most certainly includes family members, as well as the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, nor has the defendant consented to by-law interpretations that are theoretically as can be, to over stand the federal system. My classification is not open for interpretation as a Commonwealth black list system over the United States Social Security Administration, nor any other interpretation and the defendant permanently is not open for certified interpretation on his classification and the defendant's father is permanently dead.

**Respectfully appended and submitted**

**Signed under the pains and penalties of perjury,**



15 Bowdoin<sup>St</sup> Worcester 01609

Matthew M. Kracher pro se